

Application No. 10/811,732  
Reply to Office Action dated June 11, 2007

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 1 and 2. These sheets, which include Figs. 1 and 2 replace the original sheets including Figs. 1 and 2.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

This is a Response to the Office Action mailed June 11, 2007, in which a three (3) month Shortened Statutory Period for Response has been set, due to expire September 11, 2007. Nineteen (19) claims, including one (1) independent claim, were paid for in the application. Claims 15-17, 20, and 21 have been canceled. Claims 1, 4-14, 18, and 19 have been amended. New claims 22-24 have been added. No new matter has been added to the application. The Director is authorized to charge any additional fees due by way of this Amendment, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-1090. Claims 1, 4-14, 18, 19, and 22-24 are pending.

The specification has been amended to add reference numbers and to correct grammatical errors.

Submitted herewith is a Petition To Revive For Unavoidable Abandonment. As stated in the Petition, a Power of Attorney was submitted to the U.S. Patent Office in the subject application along with a Statement Under 37 C.F.R. 3.73(b). Subsequently, an Office Action was mailed to the assignee's prior counsel who did not inform the assignee or the assignee's present counsel of the Office Action. Applicants request that future correspondence be forwarded to the customer number listed in the Power of Attorney.

Objections

The drawings were objected to because the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims.

Drawings - Figure(s) 1 and 3 have been amended accordingly, and to add reference numerals. Two sheet(s) of drawing(s) is/are presented herewith for approval.

Claims 9, 10, 15, and 16 were objected to because of informalities. Claims 15 and 16 are canceled by way of this amendment, which addresses the objection.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

Claims 9 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claim 9 has been amended and claim 15 has been canceled. With respect to the rejection, Applicants respectfully refers to the last partial paragraph on page 2 which states “the light/power source of the unit may be selectable between different lamps and/or filters for the lamps to match the wavelength and light energy of the photo initiator chemistry in the inks.” Thus, the limitation appears to be supported.

35 U.S.C. §102(a) Rejections

Claims 1, 4-7, and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,467,898 issued to Codos et al. (hereinafter “Codos”).

Applicants initially note that Codos appears to be a reference under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) rather than 35 U.S.C. §102(a), having published after the earliest claimed filing dates of the subject patent application.

Codos is generally directed to printing using ultraviolet (UV) light curable inks on wide textile fabric to create quilted articles. Codos teaches, *inter alia*, printing with UV curable ink than immediately illuminating with UV light followed by heating to complete the curing of the ink, and followed by formation of the quilted article. Codos, Abstract.

Turning to the specific claim language, amended claim 1 is directed to an “apparatus to form rolls of labels” and recites: “a media path along which a web of backing material travels, the web of backing material carrying a plurality of discrete labels spaced therealong; a label rewinder located at least proximate an end of the media path with respect to a direction of travel of the web of backing material, the label rewinder configured to wind the web of backing material carrying the labels as a roll of labels; an ultraviolet (UV) cure module having at least one UV light source positioned and operable to cure ink carried by each of the labels before each respective one of the labels is overlapped by the web of backing material in the roll of labels formed by the label rewinder.”

As noted above, Codos is directed to a particular problem of printing on textile fabrics and oversized fabrics. Codos is not directed to label manufacture or label application. Codos prints on a continuous textile web, as opposed to printing on discrete labels carried by a web of backing material. Thus, Codos appears to be non-analogous with respect to the label manufacturing or label application problems addressed by Applicants. Also as noted above, Codos employs a UV source and heat to cure the ink rather than curing the ink with just UV light.

Claim 4 is dependent from claim 1, and further recites “wherein the UV cure module is built into a rewinder enclosure.” Claim 12 is dependent from claim 7 and further recites “wherein the UV cure module is built into a rewinder enclosure.” Codos does not show a separate rewinder enclosure, but rather places a take up reel in the overall printer housing. Codos, Fig. 3.

Claim 5 is dependent from claim 1 and further recites “wherein the media path is defined by belt drive that transports the labels from a printer to the label rewinder and the at least one UV light source is positioned over the belt drive.” Claim 13 is dependent from claim 7 and further recites “wherein the media path is defined by belt drive that transports the labels from a printer to the label rewinder and the at least one UV light source is positioned over the belt drive.” Codos teaches that the UV source is proximate the start of the media path, immediately following the printing of ink. Codos places a heater between the UV source and the end of the media path.

Claim 6 is dependent from claim 1 and further recites “wherein the label rewinder is an offline rewinder.” Claim 14 is dependent from claim 7 and further recites “wherein the label rewinder is an offline rewinder.” The only structure disclosed by Codos which could possibly be called a rewinder is located in the same housing as the printer. Codos, Fig. 3. There appears to be no reason to believe that an offline rewinder would be practical, particular given the size of the articles that are being handled by Codos. In fact, such a modification would appear to render the Codos apparatus inoperative for its stated purpose.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Codos in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,563,589 issued to Scheffer (hereinafter Scheffer ).

Scheffer is directed to a UV curing lamp device. Scheffer discloses: a converging type cold mirror, a UV light source, a heat absorber behind the cold mirror, a back deflector behind the heat absorber, a blocker tube, and a UV light permeable window located in front of the UV light source, all arranged to provide four different air channels for cooling.

Claim 8 depends from claim 7 and further recites “herein the UV cure module further comprises at least one filter positioned to filter light emitted by the at least one lamp.” The Office Action suggests that the cold mirror selectively reflects a broad band of UV light. Rather than suggesting a filter, such seems to suggest the opposite since a broad band of UV light would imply *no filtering*.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Codos in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,935,525 issued to Lincoln et al. (hereinafter “Lincoln”).

Lincoln is directed to an air treatment method and apparatus for reduction of volatile organic compounds, nitrous oxide and carbon dioxide in an air stream. Lincoln is completely unrelated to printing, label manufacture and/or label application. Lincoln is clearly non-analogous art. There is simply no reason that one of ordinary skill in the art of printing or label manufacturing would look to the field of pollution control for teachings related to curing ink.

Claim 11 depends from claim 7 and further recites “wherein the UV cure module further comprises a reflector, said reflector is selected from the group consisting of angled, parabolic or curved and said reflector is made of a material selected from the group of metallic and dichromic materials.” As noted above, it is inconceivable that one of skill in the art would look to a teaching so far a field as Lincoln.

Claims 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Codos, modified by Scheffer, and further in view of Lincoln.

Claim 17 is canceled.

Claim 18 is dependent on claim 9 and further recites “wherein the UV cure module further comprises a reflector, said reflector is selected from the group consisting of angled, parabolic or curved and said reflector is made of a material selected from the group of metallic and dichromic materials.”

Claim 19 is dependent on claim 10 and further recites “wherein the UV curing module further comprises a reflector, said reflector is selected from the group consisting of angled, parabolic or curved and said reflector is made of a material selected from the group of metallic and dichromic materials.”

As explained above, it is inconceivable that one of skill in the art would look to the teachings of Lincoln when dealing with the problems of printing, label manufacture and/or label application.

Claims 9, 10, 15, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Codos in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,112,335 issued to Gonser (hereinafter Gonser ).

Gonser is directed to an instrument that delivers a rapid pulse UV light for use in dentistry. The device of Gonser is directed to curing resins used to fix teeth. In particular, Gonser teaches a handheld device that delivers UV light energy to a small area. As such, Gonser appears unrelated to the problems of printing, manufacturing and/or applying labels. Gonser also appears unrelated to the problem of curing inks.

Claims 15 and 16 are canceled.

Claim 9 is dependent on claim 1 and further recites “wherein the at least one UV light source of the UV cure module comprises a plurality of lamps, the lamps selectively activated to selectively supply a selective wavelength of energy.” (Emphasis added.)

Claim 10 is dependent on claim 9 and further recites “wherein the UV cure module further comprises a plurality of filters positioned to filter light emitted by respective ones of the plurality of lamps.”

Claims 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Codos, modified by Gonser, and further in view of Lincoln.

Claims 20 and 21 are canceled.

### Conclusion

We note that the subject patent application has been placed in class 034/275. Yet, the references are from a large variety of unrelated classes and/or subclasses. Such is illustrated in the below table, with class/subclass definitions where available.

Reference	Class/Subclasses
Present Application	034/275-Material to be treated by electromagnetic energy, ultraviolet energy
Codos	347- Incremental printing of Symbolic Information /102- Drying or Curing /101-Medium processing means /96-Fluid reactive, gas
Scheffer	250/504 R-Radiant Energy 362/218-Illumination, elongated light source unit with ventilating or cooling means
Lincoln	422 Fabric (Woven, Knitted, or Nonwoven Textile or cloth) /121-Coating or impregnation absorbs chemical other than water /4- Comprising a composite fiber /24-Woven scrim, inorganic fiber including an additional scrim layer /122-Chemical material is used in bio or chem. warfare /186.3-Woven fabric comprises strips or ribbons only /171-Polypropylene fabric

	/177-Amide-aldehyde condensate /189-including strand which is of specific structural definition 96/224-Gas Separation apparatus- Germicidal lamp (UV) 96/227- Gas Separation apparatus- Germicidal lamp, Liquid Agent
Gonser	315.214R-Electrical Lamp & Discharge Devices, with additional periodic switch in primary circuit 313/184- Electrical Lamp & Discharge Devices 313/224- Electrical Lamp & Discharge Devices

Such is strong evidence of the non-analogous nature of the references, which clearly demonstrates that one of skill in the art would not look to any one, let alone the combination suggested in the Office Action without the Applicants' own teachings as a blueprint to piece together the claimed subject matter using impermissible hindsight reconstruction.

Overall, the cited references do not singly, or in any motivated combination, teach or suggest the claimed features of the embodiments recited in independent claim 1, and thus such claim is allowable. Because the remaining claims depend from allowable independent claim 1, and also because they include additional limitations, such claims are likewise allowable. If the undersigned attorney has overlooked a relevant teaching in any of the references, the Examiner is requested to point out specifically where such teaching may be found.

Application No. 10/811,732  
Reply to Office Action dated June 11, 2007

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider this application and timely allow all pending claims. Examiner Nguyen is encouraged to contact Mr. Abramonte by telephone to discuss the above and any other distinctions between the claims and the applied references, if desired. If the Examiner notes any informalities in the claims, he is encouraged to contact Mr. Abramonte by telephone to expediently correct such informalities.

Respectfully submitted,  
SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC

/Frank Abramonte/  
Frank Abramonte  
Registration No. 38,066

FXA:sc

Enclosure:

Substitute Specification  
Redlined Substitute Specification  
2 Sheets of Replacement Drawings (Figures. 1 and 2)

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 5400  
Seattle, Washington 98104  
Phone: (206) 622-4900  
Fax: (206) 682-6031

1122567\_1.DOC